SUPP MEMO PTS AUTHS OPP PRELIM INJCT

27

28

the placement of the colors is entirely different.

Likewise, if one looks at the restaurant interiors depicted in Complaint

27

28

Exhibits C and K, the colors, style, furnishings, tables, and chairs are radically different.

Similarly, the Menus shown in Complaint Exhibits D and J differ radically in categories, number and description of main courses, and the presence or absence of pictures of the main courses.

The only competent, non-Hearsay evidence of *actual* confusion is the *single* incident in August 2006, when a friend of Plaintiff's President and four of her friends visited Vu's restaurant (Appendix of Customer Declarations in support of motion). The Court should not disregard the possibility that this event may have been "staged."

The extraordinary remedy of granting a preliminary injunction should never be granted based upon such a dearth of evidence.

Dated: 8 February 2008.

Respectfully Submitted Law Offices of Christopher Hays

Christopher Hays Attorneys for Defendants KEVIN VU and CAFE BONITA, INC.

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

I am employed by Law Offices Of Christopher Hays in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is One Embarcadero Center, Suite 500, San Francisco, California 94111.

On 8 February 2008 I served the foregoing document(s) described as SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION; DECLARATION OF KEVIN VU; DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER HAYS on the interested parties in this action as stated on the attached service list as follows:

- X By placing true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s) addressed as stated on the attached service list
 - BY PERSONAL SERVICE I delivered such envelope(s) by hand to the offices of the addressee(s).
 - X BY MAIL

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice such envelope(s) would be deposited with the U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at San Francisco, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

BY OVERNIGHT MAIL: I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing via _____. Under that practice such envelope(s) would be deposited at an authorized _____ location on that same day with delivery fees fully provided for at San Francisco, California, in the ordinary course of business.

X BY E-MAIL:

On 8 February 2008, at approximately 11:45 am, I served the above stated document(s) by e-mail directed to the parties as indicated of the attached service list.

Executed on 8 February 2008 at San Francisco, California.

X (FEDERAL) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the above is true and correct.

Christopher Hays

ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

Michael W. De Vries, Esq. Andrew J. Fossum, Esq. Latham & Watkins 650 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor Costa Mesa, California 92626

<mike.devries@lw.com> <Andrew.Fossum@lw.com>